

**REMARKS**

The Office Action issued by the Examiner on November 1, 2007 and the citations referred to in the Office Action have been carefully considered. Claims 57-90 stand rejected. Claim 57, 63, 72, 79, 85, 89 and 90 have been amended. Prompt reconsideration is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC 102**

Claims 57 stands rejected as anticipated by Harayama et al. Claim 57 has been amended to distinguish over this reference. Support for the claim amendment is specifically found in paragraph [0037] of Applicants' specification. Amended claim 57 and the claims 58 through 62 depending therefrom are believed to patentably distinguish over Harayama et al.

Claims 63-67, 72-75, and 85-90 stand rejected as anticipated by Hosoi et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The translation provided by the examiner, of the Abstract, clearly states that the invention is directed to a disk reproduction device, **not** a DVD player. The title is "Device and Method **for Reproducing Disk**." Thus Hosoi et al is directed to entirely different subject matter than that which is claimed by Applicants. It is respectfully submitted that Hosoi et al teaches nothing about providing a medium that has a first instruction set that instructs the medium player **to play** the plurality of data blocks of the medium in a pre-determined uninterrupted sequence upon insertion of the medium into the medium player without any interaction from a user; and a second instruction set that instructs the medium player **to play** the plurality of data blocks of the medium in response to user commands that determine the order for playing the plurality of data blocks of the medium. On the contrary, the Hosoi et al reference is specifically directed to a DVD reproduction apparatus, i.e. an apparatus for reproducing, i.e. making copies of DVDs. Hosoi is NOT directed to a DVD **player** in any way. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has misconstrued the meaning of the highlighted words in the abstract submitted to the Applicants by the examiner. The Hosoi et al invention is not directed to a DVD player, but to a DVD copier. In particular, on the last line of the Abstract, it states:

“Then, based on the information of the stored video/title/set PTT search pointer table, **link/PTTN commands** are performed.”(emphasis added) These PTTN commands are DVD authoring commands which are used in reproducing, i.e. copying, the content of a DVD. These PTTN commands are NOT used to play a DVD. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the examiner has misconstrued the meaning of Hosoi et al., and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 65, 73, and 87, the Examiner asserts that Hosoi teaches that the medium is a digital video disc. However, the examiner has failed to point to any disclosure of Hosoi et al that is directed to a player as is claimed. This rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 66, 74 and 88, the examiner asserts that Hosoi teaches the medium of claim 63 wherein the medium player is a digital video disc player. However, Hosoi et al makes no mention of a digital video disc player. The examiner can point to no disclosure in Hosoi that mentions a DVD player. Hosoi discloses a video disk reproduction, i.e., copying apparatus, **not** a player as is claimed. This rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 68 and 75, the examiner asserts that the plurality of data blocks in Hosoi includes at least one movie. The examiner has not shown any reference within Hosoi et al. of such a disclosure. This rejection is clearly without merit and should be withdrawn.

Claims 63, 64, 72-78, and 85-90 stand rejected as anticipated by DISNEY PIXAR, MONSTER, INC. 2001 (hereinafter PIXAR). Claims 63, 72, and 85 have been amended to clearly overcome this rejection. Each of these independent claims now specifies that the first instruction set presents a menu offering a **fast play** and a **standard play** option. After a predetermined period for user interaction, the play automatically proceeds in accordance with the fast play option. PIXAR discloses no such options. Further, none of the cited references disclose such a configuration. These independent claims are believed to now be allowable. The claims depending therefrom are also believed to be allowable for the same reasons. Accordingly this rejection should be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections 35 USC 103**

Claims 69, 70 and 71 stand rejected as unpatentable over Harayama or Hosoi in view of Official Notice. These claims depend from claim 63 and are believed to be allowable for the same reason as claim 63. Therefore this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 79-84 stand rejected as unpatentable over PIXAR in view of Hirayama et al. Claim 79 has been amended to recite “a first fast play option menu selection for playing the plurality of data blocks including the feature presentation in a predetermined uninterrupted sequence and a second standard play menu selection for a user definable interactive viewing sequence of a subset of the plurality of data blocks.”

PIXAR does NOT disclose or suggest display of a first menu and automatically playing of the media content as now claimed. Hirayama et al merely teaches displaying “the program bar of the standard program movement will be automatically selected, reproduced from the disk, and displayed on the monitor.” There is no suggestion in either reference of a fast play and slow play option or presentation of such options, as are claimed, to the user. It is respectfully submitted that PIXAR and Hirayama et al do NOT disclose or suggest this feature and thus this claim is believed to patentably distinguish over PIXAR and Hirayama. Since claims 80-84 depend from amended claim 79, these claims are also believed to be allowable. This rejection should now be withdrawn.


### CONCLUSION

Claims 57 through 90 remain pending in the application. This amendment is believed to be responsive to all points in the Office Action. Support for the claim amendments is found throughout Applicants' specification and, in particular, in paragraph [0037]. It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed and that the application is now in order for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof is courteously requested.

Should the examiner have any remaining questions or concerns he is urged to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone at (303)685-7460 in order to resolve such concerns expeditiously. The Director is authorized to charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of

fee(s), or to credit any overpayments to **Deposit Account Number 50-2638**. Please ensure that Attorney Docket Number 54317-029201 is referred to when charging any payments or credits for this case.

Respectfully submitted,



John R. Wahl  
Reg. No. 33,044

Date: March 19, 2008

Customer Number 46560  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400E  
Santa Monica, CA 90404  
Phone: (310) 586-7700  
Fax: (310) 586-7800  
E-mail: laipmail@gtlaw.com